



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,351	04/06/2001	Niakam Kazemi	363	1712
47827	7590	06/28/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH LLP			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8110 GATEHOUSE ROAD, STE 500 EAST				
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			2162	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/828,351	KAZEMI, NIAKAM
Examiner	Art Unit	
Cam Y T. Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5, 7--18, 20-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-9, 12-18, 20-22 and 25-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 10,11,23 and 24 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-24 and canceled claims 6 and 19 in the amendment filed on 4/8/2005.

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-26 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued on pages 16-19 that Fujiwara does not teach a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process; associating a defect data entity with a defect category data entity; the combination of Fujiwara and Morioka does not teach features of the independent claims 1 and 14.

Examiner respectfully disagrees the entire allegation as argued. Examiner, in her previous office action, gave detail explanation of claimed limitation and pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art.

In response to applicant's argued that Fujiwara does not teach a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process; associating a defect data entity with a defect category data entity.

Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:
"a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as Defective item stores different type of defects such as operation defect and image defects. Defective item is represented as a defect category of a manufacturing process image check 01 (fig. 25, col. 19, lines 1-5);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as Machine number as defect data entity being associated with defective item as shown in figs. 25&108, col. 19, lines 1-5).

In response to applicant's argued that the combination of Fujiwara and Morioka does not teach features of the independent claims 1 and 14. However, Fujiwara alone teaches all of features of the independent claims 1 and 14 as indicated in the office action following:

As to claims 1 and 14, Jujiwara teaches a manufacturing quality information database stored in a computer-readable medium and usable for tracking quality information relating to a manufacturing process (fig. 10, col. 10, lines 45-52), comprising:

"a symptom data entity storing symptoms, which are observable states indicative of a defect, of manufacturing process defects" as nature of defect 1 stores states indicative of a defect, e.i. earth lead, abnormal image, vertical white stripe and paper end could not turn on (figs. 131 & 108);

"a defect data entity storing defects of the manufacturing process" as defective item stores defects of manufacturing process (figs. 31A-31F);

"an action data entity storing repair actions for remedying related defects" as repair contents entity stores repair actions such as exchanges, revision for related defect (fig. 131);

"a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as Defective item stores different type of defects such as

operation defect and image defects. Defective item is represented as a defect category of a manufacturing process image check 01 (fig. 25, col. 19, lines 1-5);

“said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity” as Machine number as defect data entity being associated with defective item as shown in figs. 25&108, col. 19, lines 1-5);

“ said defect data entity being associated with said symptom data entity” as defective item is associated with nature of defect 1 (fig. 131);

“said action data entity being associated with said defect data entity” as repair contents is associated with defective item (fig. 131).

For the above reason, examiner believed that rejection of the last office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 12, 14-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being by Jujiwara et al (or hereinafter “Jujiwara”) (US 6801822).

As to claims 1 and 14, Jujiwara teaches a manufacturing quality information database stored in a computer-readable medium and usable for tracking quality information relating to a manufacturing process (fig. 10, col. 10, lines 45-52), comprising:

“a symptom data entity storing symptoms, which are observable states indicative of a defect, of manufacturing process defects” as nature of defect 1 stores states indicative of a defect, e.i. earth lead, abnormal image, vertical white stripe and paper end could not turn on (figs. 131 & 108);

“a defect data entity storing defects of the manufacturing process” as defective item stores defects of manufacturing process (figs. 31A-31F);

“an action data entity storing repair actions for remedying related defects” as repair contents entity stores repair actions such as exchanges, revision for related defect (fig. 131);

“a defect category data entity for storing defect categories of the manufacturing process” as Defective item stores different type of defects such as operation defect and image defects. Defective item is represented as a defect category of a manufacturing process image check 01 (fig. 25, col. 19, lines 1-5);

“said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity” as Machine number as defect data entity being associated with defective item as shown in figs. 25&108, col. 19, lines 1-5);

“ said defect data entity being associated with said symptom data entity” as defective item is associated with nature of defect 1 (fig. 131);

“said action data entity being associated with said defect data entity” as repair contents is associated with defective item (fig. 131).

As to claims 2 and 15, Jujiwara teaches the manufacturing quality information database (figs. 10&131, col. 10, lines 45-52)

“wherein said manufacturing quality information database tracks a plurality of manufacturing processes” as shown in fig. 131,

“the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes” as process or processing names entity stores names, i.e., image check 01, completion check 01 as identities of the manufacturing processes (fig. 39);

“said symptom data entity, said defect data entity, and said action data entity being associated with said process data entity” as natural of defect 1 entity, defective item entity, repair contents entity are associated with processing name entity (fig. 131).

As to claims 3 and 16, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

“wherein said manufacturing quality information database track a plurality of manufactured items” as tracking a plurality of machines (fig. 112);

“the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: an item data entity storing identities of manufactured items” as machine number entity stores machine numbers of manufactured machines (fig. 112);

"said symptom data entity, said defect data entity, and said action data entity being associated with said item data entity" as natural of defect 1 entity, defective item entity and repair of content entity are associated with machine number entity (fig. 131).

As to claims 4 and 17, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a symptom category data entity for storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as data item entity stores different types of natural of defects such as nature of defect 1 entity, nature of defect 2 entity. Each natural of defect entity stores different natural of defect; thus, data item store different natural of defects. Data item entity is represented as a symptom category data entity. Nature of defect 1 and natural of defect 2 are represented as categories of manufacturing defects (fig. 14);

" said symptom data entity being associated with said symptom category data entity" as nature of defect 1 entity is associated with data item entity (figs. 14 &131).

As to claims 5 and 18, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"wherein said manufacturing quality information database tracks a plurality of manufacturing processes" as (fig. 131),

"a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as process or processing names entity stores names, i.e., image check 01, completion check 01 as identities of the manufacturing processes (fig. 39);

"the manufacturing quality information database further comprising: a process data entity storing identities of the manufacturing processes" as (fig. 39)

" a process/symptom frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the manufacturing process identifies" as the number of defects entity is represented as a process/symptom frequency data (fig. 110).

As to claims 12 and 25, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a symptom category data entity storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects" as data item entity stores different types of natural of defects such as nature of defect 1 entity, nature of defect 2 entity. Each natural of defect entity stores different natural of defect; thus, data item store different natural of defects. Data item entity is represented as a symptom category data entity. Nature of defect 1 and natural of defect 2 are represented as categories of manufacturing defects (fig. 14);

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as items entity stores defective item entity. Since defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76);

"said symptom data entity being associated with said symptom category data entity" as nature of defect 1 entity is associated with data item entity (figs. 14 &131).

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as items entity stores defective item entity. Since defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76)

"said defect category entity being associated with said symptom category" as (figs. 14 &131).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Morioka (US 6611728).

As to claims 7 and 20 Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a symptom/defect frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the symptom categories and the defect categories". Morioka teaches defect category and number of defect during process (figs. 31 &9).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Morioka's teaching of defect category and

number of defect during process to Fujiwara's system in order to repair defects of product efficiently.

6. Claims 8, 9, 13, 21-22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara.

As to claims 8 and 21, Fujiwara discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "an action category data entity storing action categories; said action data entity being associated with said action category data entity". However, Fujiwara teaches items entity store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action repair content. Thus, items entity store different action repair content. Items entity is associated with each repair content entity (fig. 76).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fujiwara's teaching of teaches items entity store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action repair content. Thus, items entity store different action repairs content in order to allow a user to keep track all of defects of products in order easily.

As to claims 9 and 22, Fujiwara discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 8, except the claimed limitation "a defect/action frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the defect categories and the

action categories". However, Fujiwara teaches items entity stores the number of defects that related to defective item and repair contents (fig. 76).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fujiwara's teaching of teaches items entity store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action repair content. Thus, items entity stores different action repair content in order to allow a user to keep track all of defects of products that are repair in order easily.

As to claims 13 and 26, Fujiwara teaches the claimed limitations:

"a defect category data entity storing defect categories of the manufacturing process" as items entity stores defective item entity. Since defective item entity store different kind of defects; thus, items entity stores different type of defects of the manufactory process (fig. 76);

"said defect data entity being associated with said defect category data entity" as (figs. 76 &131).

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an action category data entity storing action categories; said action data entity being associated with said action category data entity". However, Fujiwara teaches items entity store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action repair content. Thus, items entity store different action repair content. Items entity is associated with each repair content (fig. 76).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fujiwara's teaching of teaches items entity store different type of repair contents. Since different each repair content stores different action repair content. Thus, items entity stores different action repair content in order to allow a user to keep track all of defects of products that are repair in order easily.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10-11 and 23-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claims 10 and 23, none of the prior art of record such as Fujiwara and Morioka does not teach or fairly suggest "a symptom category data entity storing symptom categories of manufacturing defects; a process/symptom/defect frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the manufacturing process identities, the system categories and the defect categories".

As to claims 11 and 24, none of the prior art of record such as Fujiwara and Morioka does not teach or fairly suggest "an action category data entity storing action categories; and a process/symptom/defect/action frequency data entity observing a relationship frequency between the manufacturing process identities, the symptom categories, the defect categories, and the action categories".

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162
1/10/2005


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER